

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/255,777	02/23/1999	SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI	0756-1936	9041	
*	90 01/09/2002			**	
	XBEY FRIEDMAN LEEDOM & FERGUSON PC		EXAMINER		
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE SUITE 800			EXAMINER BOOTH, RICHARD A  ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	BOOTH, RICHARD A	
MCLEAN, VA	22102		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	·		2812		

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>	•		a
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
ŧ' ,	09/255,777	YAMAZAKI ET AL.7	ŕ
Offic Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard A. Booth	2812	
The MAILING DATE of this communicati n app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repleted in the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute.  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	136(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communic  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27</u>	November 2001		
	his action is non-final.		,
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	ance except for formal ma		its is
Disposition of Claims			9
4) Claim(s) <u>12,13,15-19,21-24,26-43,46-58,60,6</u>	61,65-71 and 75-84 is/are	pending in the application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•		
6) Claim(s) 12-13, 15-19, 21-24, 26-43, 46-58, 66	<u>0-61, 65-71, and 75-84</u> is/	are rejected	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers	d		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	pted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ o	disapproved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	ply to this Office action.		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			-
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received in A	Application No	
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bu</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_	
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	ic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional applic	ation).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro	ovisional application has b	een received.	
Attachment(s)	•		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/255,777

Art Unit: 2812

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-13, 15, 17, 23-24, 26, 28-31, 33-39, 41-43, 46, 48-58, 60--61, 65, 67-71, 75 and 77-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Zdebel, U.S. Patent 5,154,946 and Wolf et al. and further in view of Yamazaki, U.S. Patent 4,727,044.

Chang shows the invention substantially as claimed including forming an amorphous or polysilicon semiconductor layer 34 on an insulating surface 32 with a thickness of, for example, 1000 angstroms (see column 4, lines 59-60); introducing boron 36 into the semiconductor layer so that the boron implanted region becomes at least part of the channel region (see Figure 2); forming a gate insulating film 40 on the semiconductor layer; forming a gate electrode 42 on said gate insulating film; and forming source and drain regions (46,48) by implanting boron ions 44 into the semiconductor layer using the gate electrode 42 as a self-aligning mask to form source and drain regions (see Figures 2-6 and column 4, line 55 – column 5, line 37).

Chang lacks anticipation of forming the film as amorphous silicon and then converting to polysilicon, performing the implant of the channel region as shown in Figure 2 through an insulating film, performing laser crystallization through the insulating

Application/Control Number: 09/255,777

Art Unit: 2812

film, and forming the gate insulating film using TEOS. With respect to forming the gate insulating film of TEOS, official notice has been taken of this fact in previous office actions. If applicant does not seasonably traverse the well known statement during examination, then the object of the well known statement is taken to be admitted prior art (see In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943)). A seasonable challenge constitutes a demand for evidence made as soon as practicable during prosecution (see MPEP 2144.02).

With regard to the implantation in Figure 2 being formed through an insulating film, Zdbel discloses using a screen oxide prior to implantation, performing implantation, and removing the screen oxide using wet etching (see column 2, line 65 – column 3, line 40). In view of this disclosure, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the screen oxide in Zdebel and remove the screen oxide in the primary reference of Chang, because as additionally taught by Wolf, the formation of screen oxides is used in order to protect the semiconductor substrate from implantation damage (see prior office actions). Wolf also teaches that depositing a polysilicon film as amorphous followed by subsequent crystallization is an improvement because the deposited surface is smoother (see previous office actions).

Concerning laser crystallization through the insulating film, Yamazaki discloses forming an insulating film over the entire semiconductor layer prior to a laser irradiation process (see column 5, lines 49-55). In view of this disclosure, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form an

Application/Control Number: 09/255,777

Art Unit: 2812

the recombination center neutralizer from outdiffusing and would also prevent reflection.

With respect to claims 23 and 41, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to form aluminum gate electrodes.

Claims 16, 18-19, 21-22, 27, 32, 40, 47, 66, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Zdebel, U.S. Patent 5,154,946 and Wolf et al. and further in view of Yamazaki, U.S. Patent 4,727,044 as applied to claims 12-13, 15, 17, 23-24, 26, 28-31, 33-39, 41-43, 46, 48-58, 60--61, 65, 67-71, and 77-84 above, and further in view of Han, U.S. Patent 4,599,118.

Han is applied as in paper #16 mailed 2-6-01 for the reasons of record.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11-27-01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that boron being implanted through an insulating film into at least a channel region is not shown and asks the examiner to point out where this limitation is shown. However, this rejection is not made under 35 USC 102, and the rejection under 35 USC 103 provides ample reasons and motivations as to why such a limitation is obvious. For instance, Zdebel clearly shows using an insulating film as an implant screen and Wolf provides beneficial reasons regarding why an implant screen is commonly used.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard A. Booth whose telephone number is 308-3446. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Niebling can be reached on 308-3325. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 308-7724 for regular communications and 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-1782.

Richard A. Booth Primary Examiner Art Unit 2812